

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 90-94, 96-98, and 100 are currently pending in the present application. The Examiner has rejected claims 90-94, 96-97, and 100, and objected to claim 98 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants address the Examiner's comments in the order made.

Support for the amendments to claim 90 may be found in the specification generally at pages 34 (all) and 35 (lines 1-15), and more specifically at page 34, lines 13-20, and at example XIV, beginning at page 95. Support for the amendments to claim 91 may be found in the specification at page 35, lines 5-8, and page 98, lines 4-9. Each of these citations may be found hereinafter with regard to the specific discussion of the claim amendments.

1. The Examiner has rejected claims 90-94, 96-97, and 100 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of screening an anti-A $\beta$  antibody for activity in antibody-mediated clearance of an amyloid deposit of A $\beta$ , allegedly does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of screening any antibody and requiring a positive response, as broadly claimed.

The Examiner's comments have been carefully considered and applicants have amended independent claim 90 to clarify that the method of screening an antibody is intended to identify "*whether* a reduction in the amount of the amyloid deposit remaining in the medium *occurs* (emphasis added)," rather than that such a reduction is a necessary consequence of the screening method itself. Applicants would agree that not every antibody screened will induce a clearing effect; if each did there would be no point in performing the screening method. Applicants submit that the currently amended claim 90 makes clear that such clearance activity is not a precondition of the claimed screening method, but rather that the method itself is intended to identify those antibodies that induce the phagocytic clearing activity of the microglial cells against the amyloid deposit.

Because all other claims depend directly or indirectly from claim 90, applicants submit that the amendment to claim 90 as described hereinbefore addresses the Examiner's comments with regard to the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejections.

2. The Examiner has rejected claim 90 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly incomplete for omitting essential steps, namely, a comparison of the reduction in the amount of the amyloid deposit to a control sample or culture.

Applicants have amended claim 90 to address the Examiner's comments, specifically indicating that the "monitoring [of] a reduction in the amount of the amyloid deposit remaining in the medium" is "compared to a baseline measurement" to assess whether a reduction in the amount of the amyloid deposit has, in fact, occurred. Support for this amendment may be found in the specification at page 34, lines 13-20.

3. The Examiner has rejected claim 90 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because of claim language which makes it appear that the antibody itself is responsible for clearing the amyloid deposits.

Applicants have amended claim 90 to indicate that the screening method is intended to identify whether an antibody demonstrates "activity in inducing clearance of an amyloid deposit," and that an observed reduction in the amount of the amyloid deposit indicates that "the antibody induces phagocytic clearing activity of the microglial cells against the amyloid deposit." Support for this amendment may be found in Example XIV, beginning at page 95 of the specification.

4. The Examiner has rejected claim 91 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because of the recitation of "an antigen," which, according to the Examiner's comments, makes it unclear which antigen is being monitored in the claimed method.

Applicants have amended claim 91 to more specifically indicate that "the antigen is A $\beta$  or another antigen associated with the amyloid deposit." Support for this amendment may be found in the specification at page 35, lines 5-8. The Examiner is correct in pointing out that claim 90, even as amended, recites a screening method for clearance of "an amyloid deposit of A $\beta$ ." As such, A $\beta$  is a reasonable choice for the antigen to be monitored. However, the application also contemplates monitoring of another antigen (other than A $\beta$ ) associated with the amyloid deposit through which a reduction in the amount of the amyloid deposit of A $\beta$  may be identified as a result of the vicarious phagocytosis of A $\beta$  in conjunction with the other, monitored

Application No. 09/724,288  
Amendment dated July, 20 2007  
Reply to Office Action of April 23, 2007

PATENT

antigen. See, e.g., specification at page 35, lines 5-8 and page 98, lines 4-9. Applicants submit that the current amendment makes clear that the antigen may be either A $\beta$  or another amyloid deposit-associated antigen.

5. The objection to claim 98 is believed to be addressed by the previously described amendments overcoming the rejection of claim 97, although a specific reference to "monoclonal" is hereby added to the claim via amendment.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Rosemarie L. Celli  
Reg. No. 42,397

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
R1C/vp  
LAT:ym  
61095623 v1